DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 234 655 HE 016 550

AUTHOR Norris, Donald M.
TITLE Triage and the Art of Institutional Research.
INSTITUTION Association for Institutional Research.
PUB DATE 83
NOTE 9p.; Not available in paper copy due to small print of the original.
AVAILABLE FROM The Association for Institutional Research, 314 Stone Building, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 32306 ($2.00).
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Collected Works - Serials (022)
JOURNAL CIT AIR Professional File; n16 Spr-Sum 1983

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS College Planning; Decision Making; Evaluation Needs; Higher Education; *Information Needs; *Institutional Research; *Research Design; *Research Reports; *Statistical Data
IDENTIFIERS *Information Overload

ABSTRACT

Principles that institutional researchers should follow are discussed. The most important dictate is to present decision-makers the bare minimum of information necessary for the task; the material should be simple, short, and succinct. A report to assist decision-makers should not include extensive supporting documentation. The first step is to define or redefine the research question. When data are being provided to support policy analysis, some interpretation or accompanying narrative should usually be given. The design of the report should fit the purpose of the proposed analysis, with some consideration to the format preferred by the individual requesting the information. The researcher should provide a mix of presentations and should recognize the advantages of graphics. Printouts should never be sent to executive officers or deans unless they are accompanied by an explanation and interpretation. The researcher needs to select from various information sources the information that can illuminate the decision under consideration. In addition, it is important to take time to prepare an executive summary. Four figures are presented, including an illustration of an induced course load matrix and a sample executive summary page. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

THE AIR PROFESSIONAL FILE No. 16, Spring--Summer 1983

The Association for Institutional Research

ED234655

TRIAGE AND THE ART OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Donald M. Norris
Director, Office of Policy Analysis
University of Houston-University Park

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AIR

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

✓ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

HE 016 550

The AIR Professional File No. 16, Spring–Summer 1983
The Association for Institutional Research

TRIAGE AND THE ART OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Donald M. Norris
Director, Office of Policy Analysis
University of Houston-University Park

There is an overwhelming tide in the affairs of humankind toward increasing complexity and information overload. Simple ideas are rendered complex, and complex ideas become obscured by too much information, jargon, and professional mumbo jumbo. This *tide* has become a *tidal wave* in the academic world. Institutional researchers are often preoccupied with the more complex and arcane aspects of research design, ever-growing management information systems, and the configuration of sophisticated "decision-support systems." Yet, the finest work of analysis imaginable can be rendered ineffective if it is not presented thoughtfully and in a manner congruent with the needs and preferences of decision makers. Indeed, the single most precious gift that an analyst can give is the clear and thoughtful presentation of the bare minimum of information necessary for the task. This is what separates successful institutional researchers from those who toil in the vineyards with little achievement or recognition.

Unfortunately, this is not a lesson that is easily learned. Through personal experience, from those brief and scintillating thrills of victory punctuated by the all too common agonies of defeat, one comes to appreciate the importance of this issue. Colleagues have shared with me, at my request, their "war stories" of similar disappointments—sorrowful tales of elegant works of analysis which were blissfully ignored or, even worse, reviled. No one is immune; in fact, the more experienced institutional researcher, having survived many an analytical campaign, may be even more prone than the newcomer to overlook the basics of successful presentation. In any case, my receipt of the commisserations of colleagues has made me the caretaker of a precious piece of oral history and has moved me to share the following maxims with the readers of the *AIR Professional File*. My purpose is to help others avoid certain peril if the maxims are ignored.

Before revealing these tenets, however, it is important to consider the "target" of much of an institutional researcher's work. The mission of an institutional researcher is to attempt to influence the decision making of the Academic Administrator. Consider such persons for a moment; study carefully their characteristics. Their body language often tells the story: brows ridged and deeply furrowed from considering a host of issues; eyes weary from scrutinizing too many words and figures; minds assaulted by too many facts, many of them contradictory; and shoulders bent from attempting to apportion time between many conflicting activities. Their decision-making style is personalized, even idiosyncratic, and they like it that way. Even if they are moderately rational and "numerate" in their approach to problems, they like the figures *their way*. Like most decision makers in academia, they are bright, but they may be naive about some aspects of administration or possess a perspective that has been shaped irrevocably ("distorted" may be a more appropriate term in a few extreme cases) by specialized training in a particular academic discipline. Moreover, even the most facile mind among them seldom utilizes more than six or seven relevant pieces of information in making a decision, and the chances are that they have already received at least a dozen.

If you try to influence these persons with a thirty-page report, supported by three technical appendices, all that this author can do is wish you good luck in your new job—whatever or wherever it might be.

However, you need not fall into the trap which has devoured so many hapless souls—if you abide by the following tenets:

Adhere to the KISS Principle

This is the first and greatest commandment, and it supercedes all others. The KISS Principle, roughly defined, means Keep It Sweet and Simple, with its corollaries, Keep It Short and Keep It Succinct. Few decision makers are interested in background, elegant analysis, or anything that would interest your standard, garden-variety professor of operations research. Indeed, we could probably achieve ninety percent of the goals of effective institutional research if we would simply abide by the KISS Principle. However, that is too easy for most of us—which proves my point. Since such a classic principle cannot be accepted at face value in such pristine form, the following additional rules are offered.

Avoid the Safety Patrol Syndrome

The fact that you were Captain of the Safety Patrol when you were in grammar school undoubtedly affected your personal development and the position you hold today, but that doesn't mean you should cite this experience on your curriculum vita. The same reasoning will help you to understand that because your analysis is supported by pages and pages of tables, graphs, and other figures is no reason for you to include them in your report. You may be proud of the many tables, but the decision maker will not usually share your enthusiasm. If you have an uncontrollable urge to have them "in print," bind and donate them to the campus library archives. But do not, under any circumstances, include them in any document which you expect to create an impact based on the power, not the weight, of its message.

This is where the concept of Triage applies: You should forward only those pieces of analysis which will make your case. Others must be discarded. If you don't practice Triage in your presentation, your superior may practice it on you. Take your choice.

Answer the Question, but First, Define the Question

How often have you received requests which go something like, "Pull together some data on this," or "What can you tell me about that?"—or questions which are even more vague or downright misleading? Few who request information and few decision makers looking for policy analysis have a precise idea of the question they want answered, let alone what they want in the way of analysis. Even if they do, their initial notion may require substantial modification as analysis becomes available

and the problem unfolds. Consequently, it falls to the institutional researcher to take creative license in defining or redefining the question and then answering it with the greatest economy of words and figures.

It should be obvious that even a fine work of analysis, sagely presented, can fall short of the mark if the problem is defined improperly or if the basic question is not answered. Too much of this and you will be answering the wrong question, however brilliantly, for someone else.

Provide Information According to Its Purpose

Clearly, regular collections of statistical information, such as factbooks and simple information requests, require neither the quantity of synthesis nor the combination of words and figures which are required by policy analysis. A general rule is that, whenever possible, one should provide the minimum of information required to fulfill a particular request, uncluttered with excess verbiage and unnecessary analysis. However, if information is being provided to support policy analysis, some interpretation or accompanying narrative should usually be given to put the figures in perspective. One must evaluate the purpose and prospective application of the information while deciding how to cast it.

Match Your Information with Its Recipients

The issue of recipients is as important as purpose and content. The question of who is to be *excluded* from the distribution list is as important as that of who should be *included*. All administrators seem to have preferences for particular types of data: some like data presented in straight tabular form; others prefer charts and graphs; many prefer an executive summary where the figures have been translated into simple, expository English; while others have made up their minds already and merely want a comfortable pile of data (in some cases the more the better) which makes them feel secure about their prejudgments. A small but increasing number want the basic information maintain on line so that they can analyze it themselves. Clearly, one cannot design a different piece of analysis for everyone. The design must fit the conditions and purpose of the proposed analysis. It does make sense, however, to be aware of the preferences for analytical style and presentation of one's chief executive officers and to attempt to match the preferences—which include the extent to which data is to be supported by analyses and interpretation. It is helpful to know how strong these preferences are, for there is no advantage in providing interpretation to a president who wants just the figures.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN
OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL STUDIES

INDUCED COURSE LOAD MATRIX (ICLM)

FALL 1976

SCHOOL OF COMMUNICATIONS
DEPARTMENT OF ADVERTISING

		AVERAGE SEMESTER CREDIT HOUR LOAD TAKEN BY STUDENTS MAJORING IN THIS DEPARTMENT					AVERAGE SEMESTER CREDIT HOUR LOAD TAKEN BY STUDENTS MAJORING IN OTHER DEPARTMENTS IN THIS COLLEGE					AVERAGE SEMESTER CREDIT HOUR LOAD TAKEN BY STUDENTS MAJORING IN OTHER COLLEGES				
		L.D.	U.D.	U'GRAD TOTAL	MAST.	DOCT.	L.D.	U.D.	U'GRAD TOTAL	MAST.	DOCT.	L.D.	U.D.	U'GRAD TOTAL	MAST.	DOCT.
AVERAGE SEMESTER CREDIT HRS TAUGHT BY THIS DEPARTMENT	U'GRAD COURSES	3.84	4.55	4.49	2.53		.31	.27	.29	.05		.02	.04	.03		
	GRADUATE COURSES		.01	.01	4.26					.01	.04					
	TOTAL	3.84	4.56	4.50	6.79		.31	.28	.29	.06	.04	.02	.04	.03		
AVERAGE SEMESTER CREDIT HRS TAUGHT BY OTHER DEPARTMENTS IN THIS COLLEGE	U'GRAD COURSES	1.56	.99	1.03	.16											
	GRADUATE COURSES				1.42											
	TOTAL	1.56	.99	1.03	1.58											
AVERAGE SEMESTER CREDIT HRS TAUGHT BY OTHER COLLEGES	U'GRAD COURSES	8.24	8.17	8.18	.21											
	GRADUATE COURSES				1.26											
	TOTAL	8.24	8.17	8.18	1.47											
AVERAGE SEMESTER CREDIT HRS TAUGHT BY ALL COLLEGES	U'GRAD COURSES	13.68	13.71	13.70	2.89											
	GRADUATE COURSES		.01	.01	6.95											
	TOTAL	13.68	13.72	13.71	9.84											

L.D. = LOWER DIVISION
U.D. = UPPER DIVISION
U'GRAD = UNDERGRADUATE

Figure 1: Induced Course Load Matrix (ICLM) which is distributed at the University of Texas at Austin to the department chairs and deans who have responsibility for the units involved. Reprinted by permission.

A corollary commandment to that of selective distribution is to design the layout of your printouts to suit the likely public, not your system analysts. A poorly designed and labeled layout, even if accompanied by appropriate documentation, will create a negative impression. For example, we have all seen Induced Course Load Matrix (ICLM) layouts where each page has far too many figures. Few are as clearly designed as the one in Figure 1, which is distributed at the University of Texas at Austin to the department chairs and deans who have responsibility for the units involved. In this case, an economy of information, clearly presented and explained, makes a most effective presentation.

Beware the Perils of Printout Worship

Seldom can any report extracted from the computer, no matter how wisely designed, be considered to be "analysis" without some additional work. The information needs to be interpreted, explained, and presented in some other form. A three-inch stack of printouts may be a thing of exquisite beauty to you and the life's work of your systems analyst, but to many potential users it is an unspeakable horror to be avoided at all costs. Never, under any circumstance, send such a printout to a group of executive officers or to the deans unless it is accompanied by an explanation and interpretation! The size of the printout may be reduced by eliminating data or analyses of those academic and/or administrative units for which the particular dean or executive officer is not directly responsible.

A corollary rule is not to trust second and third parties to extract information from your printouts which you could do yourself before distribution. You do not know how your figures might be misinterpreted or how critical distinctions might be missed—perhaps resulting in your information being blamed for poor decisions. If you are to be maligned, it is best to have nobody to blame but yourself.

A second corollary, which seems too basic to mention but which is regularly ignored, is that one should never be in too great a hurry to distribute that latest output "hot off the press." Time should be taken to check it thoroughly and to provide the necessary accompanying documentation or narrative. Despite the protestations of those who wanted the figures last week, it is better to present the right information in proper form—even if it takes a little longer.

Be the Winner of the Scavenger Hunt Award

It is not without reason that successful institutional researchers develop the reputation as the most consummate pack rats on campus. While some may not appreciate this approach to analysis, it is clear that a successful institutional researcher must be able to draw information from a host of sources to address a legion of needs, some of which can be anticipated but others of which are purely serendipitous. Successful institutional researchers do not generally win renown by being able to provide a single, particular type of data better than anyone on campus, but

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON CENTRAL CAMPUS
STATISTICAL HANDBOOK

	Actual Value 1976-77	Increase or Decrease 1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	Actual Value 1981-82
Fall Headcount Enrollment	29,812	-	+	-	+	-	28,295
Undergraduate	21,026	-	-	-	+	-	18,581
Postbaccalaureate	2,559	-	+	-	+	-	2,696
Special Professional	1,437	+	+	+	+	+	1,577
Graduate	4,790	+	+	-	+	+	5,441
Fall SCH	318,163	-	+	-	+	-	299,000
Undergraduate	265,539	-	-	-	+	-	234,427
Masters	26,025	+	+	-	+	+	31,789
Doctoral	6,710	+	+	-	+	-	9,570
Special Professional	19,889	+	+	+	+	+	23,214
Average SCH Load	10.7	NC	-	-	-	+	10.6
Undergraduate	11.6	NC	NC	+	-	+	11.7
Postbaccalaureate	6.2	NC	NC	-	NC	+	6.2
Masters	7.4	+	-	-	-	+	7.2
Doctoral	7.6	+	+	-	+	+	9.7
Special Professional	13.7	+	-	+	+	+	14.4
Degrees Awarded, Academic Year							
Bachelors	3,280	-	-	+	-	2,713 (80-81)	NA
Masters	888	+	+	+	-	1,009 (80-81)	NA
Doctoral	117	+	+	+	-	113 (80-81)	NA
Special Professional	419	-	-	+	+	456 (80-81)	NA
Instructional Staff FTE							
Ranked Faculty	NA	983	+	+	+	+	1,023
Other Instructional Staff	NA	485	+	-	-	-	457
Headcount Instructional Staff	NA	2,150	+	+	+	-	2,153
Ranked Faculty	NA	972	+	+	+	-	974
Other Instructional Staff	NA	1,178	+	+	+	-	1,179
Investment in Physical Plant (millions)	$ 201	+	+	+	236 (79-80)	NA	NA
Investment/FTE Student	$ 7,716	+	+	-	8,915 (79-80)	NA	1,179
Educational & general Space (thousands ft^2)	1,906	+	+	+	+	-	2,300
E&G Space/FTE Student (ft^2/FTE)	72	+	+	+	+	+	92
Research Awards in Force (millions)	$ 12.05	+	-	-	+	$14.17 (80-81)	NA

NA = Not Available
NC = No Change
+ = Increase
- = Decrease

Figure 2: An example of an executive summary page utilized in the factbook of the University of Houston-University Park to summarize some major institutional trends. Reprinted by permission.

by being able to provide a wide range of information on different areas and to combine this information in an effective manner.

The key to all of this is synthesis. The institutional researcher, in marshalling a host of sources for qualitative and quantitative information, is positioned uniquely to select the half dozen or so pieces of information which can truly illuminate the decision under consideration. Sorting the spoils of the scavenger hunt into those which are valuable and those which are worthless is the mark of a successful institutional researcher.

Take Time to Summarize

Almost no analytical report or piece of interpretation is so complex that it cannot be summarized in some manner. For most reports, it pays to take time to prepare an executive summary (or, if you have a lot of time, a one-page summary) to ensure that the report will be considered by decision makers. Within particular collections of information or policy analyses, there are generally one or two synthesizing tables which capture the essence of the information. These should be brought to the decision maker's attention, with the understanding that detailed backup is available but that these tables "tell the tale."

Figure 2 is an example of an executive summary page utilized in the factbook of the University of Houston-University Park to summarize some of the major institutional trends. It appears at the beginning of the factbook, serving not only as a summary but also as notice to the reader that what follows is probably designed with the needs of a busy decision maker in mind.

Some collections of information, such as departmental budget comparisons, factbooks, or other resource allocation documents, are by their nature comprehensive and intended to provide a large amount of data for consideration of a variety of problems. It makes sense, in such cases, to design the data layout carefully to use a single page for each unit of analysis, whenever possible. This makes it possible for the reader to easily synthesize and interpret the information. A page from the departmental budget book at the University of Texas at Austin provides a good example (Figure 3).

Figure 4 presents an example of the analysis of the peer data exchange conducted by the University of Houston. The key performance indicators derived from raw data are summarized on one page for this particular department; only the most important derived indicators are included. It is not terribly simple, but it contains on one page selected information needed to analyze this department.

Another tactic is to prepare a book of abstracts, such as the sample portrayed in Figure 5 from Georgia State University. This collection summarizes the major findings of research efforts and places the summaries in one location. It also cites the distribution of the report. A similar volume is being compiled at the University of Houston, where the major findings of each research and policy analysis effort are summarized on one page. The reports are separated into topical segments where a single page will not suffice. The book will be kept in loose-leaf form and updated and will also be maintained on line for access by campus executives.

The University of Texas at Austin
Office of Institutional Studies

DEPARTMENTAL BUDGET INFORMATION TABLE

Department Architecture — College Architecture & Planning

		76-77 Actual	76-77 Index	75-76 Index	74-75 Index	73-74 Index			76-77 Actual	76-77 Index	75-76 Index	74-75 Index	73-74 Index
FTE Faculty (Budgeted)	D						Resident* Instruction Budget	D					124
	C	36.64	112	114	113	111		C	905,394	156	149	133	125
	U	1,732.59	117	111	109	100		U	60,997,030	156	142	123	116
Fall Term Headcount Majors	D	623	95	90	100	109	Consumer Price Index (1971-2=100)				135.4	127.0	118.8
	C	709	101	97	103	110							
	U	41,387	104	107	105	102							
Fall Term Undergrad. SCH	D	7,600	101	98	108	113	Teaching Staff Salaries	D					
	C	7,600	101	98	108	113		C	694,457	141	138	124	117
	U	446,769	97	100	100	101		U	44,817,224	152	139	120	114
Fall Term Graduate SCH	D	462	342	347	173	271	Other Personnel Costs	D					166
	C	[illegible]242	272	311	201	203		C	175,883	254	220	191	171
	U	[illegible]613	111	116	108	81		U	10,084,030	203	180	151	147
Fall Term FTE Students	D	545.17	106	103	109	116	Maintenance Operation & Equipment	D					103
	C	610.17	113	113	114	119		C	24,840	168	146	116	116
	U	36,773.09	100	105	102	99		U	2,983,080	167	141	117	120
Resident Instruction Budget/FTE Students	D						Wholesale Price Index (1971-2=100)				153.1	144.3	122.5
	C	1,484	139	132	117	104							
	U	1,659	156	138	121	117							
Fall Term Student/ Faculty Ratio	D						Avg. FAculty Salaries as % of Univ. Averages	P	86	82	84	85	
	C	16.65	16.38	16.60	17.80			AP	96	93	97	96	
	U	21.22	23.07	23.17	22.84			aP	92	95	98	95	
								I	99	88	91	102	
Fall Term Student/ Teaching Staff Ratio	D						% Faculty Tenure	D					
	C	15.44	13.21	15.42	16.50			C	44.0	46.5	40.4		
	U	16.36	17.54	17.64	17.40			U	56.2	56.5	54.8		

* The Departments of Architecture and Community and Regional Planning were budgeted separately prior to 1974-75.

Office of Policy Analysis
Vice Chancellor for Administration

Figure 3: A page from the departmental budget book at the University of Texas at Austin. Reprinted by permission.

PEER DATA ANALYSIS
BY INSTRUCTIONAL GROUP

DATE 09/16/81 PAGE 1

		SEM CREDIT HRS/ RANKED FACULTY FTE		FACULTY SALARIES/ SEM CREDIT HRS		MAINT & OPER/ SEM CREDIT HRS		TOTAL FUNDS/ SEM CREDIT HRS		% GRAD SCH/ TOT SCH	% TA FTE/ TOT FAC FTE
		*	%	*	%	*	%	*	%		
HOUSTON ACCOUNTING	73	817.59 [8]	133.6% [9]	25.47 [8]	65.0% [8]	0.71 [8]	9.4%< [11]	27.81 [10]	51.4% [10]	13.1% [5]	25.8% [7]
1 ACCOUNTING	73	963.62 [6]	158.2% [7]	27.69 [6]	74.1% [3]	1.59 [4]	28.4% [6]	30.96 [7]	60.5% [5]	5.3% [9]	32.2% [4]
2 ACCOUNTING	73	1001.97 [5]	170.0% [4]	24.93 [9]	60.7% [10]	1.69 [3]	36.2% [2]	29.51 [9]	51.8% [9]	16.7% [3]	25.8% [6]
13 ACCOUNTING	78	779.52 [9]	141.5% [8]	38.87 [3]	71.8% [4]	2.43 [2]	50.1% [1]	44.10 [2]	61.3% [4]	18.0% [2]	18.8% [8]
18 ACCOUNTING	78	1656.64 [1]	222.4% [1]	22.02 [10]	56.0% [11]	4.46 [1]	32.2% [4]	32.32 [5]	45.1% [11]	6.5% [8]	33.5% [3]
9 ACCOUNTING	78	605.36 [11]	129.6% [10]	41.23 [2]	64.8% [9]	0.40 [10]	11.5% [10]	41.62 [4]	62.0% [3]	% [ ]	% [ ]
19 ACCOUNTING	78	692.59 [10]	117.6% [11]	38.67 [4]	86.6% [2]	[ ]	% [ ]	41.71 [3]	74.7% [2]	14.8% [4]	14.7% [9]
7 ACCOUNTANCY	78	1006.38 [4]	169.0% [5]	28.46 [5]	70.2% [5]	1.20 [5]	34.7% [3]	30.96 [8]	58.4% [8]	9.9% [6]	40.7% [1]
3 ACCOUNTING	78	1291.08 [3]	177.5% [3]	20.39 [12]	66.3% [7]	0.36 [11]	21.3% [7]	21.47 [12]	60.4% [6]	7.4% [7]	38.6% [2]
14 ACCOUNTING	78	820.53 [7]	160.9% [6]	27.56 [7]	69.1% [6]	0.87 [6]	29.0% [5]	31.53 [6]	59.3% [7]	4.6% [10]	% [ ]
20 ACCOUNTING	78	595.09 [12]	116.3% [12]	44.07 [1]	106.9% [1]	0.60 [9]	13.7% [9]	53.10 [1]	93.5% [1]	2.1% [11]	26.1% [5]
12 ACCOUNTING	73	1301.20 [2]	209.9% [2]	21.10 [11]	48.8% [12]	0.85 [7]	14.4% [8]	21.95 [11]	44.7% [12]	27.3% [1]	7.4% [10]
AVERAGE		960.13	158.9%	30.04	70.0%	1.38	25.5%	33.92	60.3%	11.4%	26.4%
WEIGHTED AVERAGE		963.75	162.4%	27.40	64.1%	1.56	26.1%	31.40	54.3%	12.5%	26.7%
HIGH VALUE		1656.64	222.4%	44.07	106.9%	4.46	50.1%	53.10	93.5%	27.3%	40.7%
LOW VALUE		595.09	116.3%	20.39	48.8%	0.36	9.4%	21.47	44.7%	2.1%	7.4%

COLUMN HEADINGS: * - MEASURE FOR INSTRUCTIONAL GROUP WITHIN A UNIVERSITY
% - COMPARATIVE PERCENTAGE OF INSTRUCTIONAL GROUP MEASURE TO UNIVERSITY MEASURE

UH KEYS: < - LOW DEPT
> - HIGH DEPT

Figure 4: An example of the peer data exchange conducted by the University of Houston. Reprinted by permission.

Don't Forget the Old Saying about a Picture Being Worth 1,000 Words

While some decision makers like data in tabular form, others prefer a pictorial or graphic presentation. Regardless of preference, however, the advances in graphic display capabilities and other means of pictorial depiction have opened new possibilities to the institutional researcher. Many members of boards of regents have experience in the corporate world where they are richly supplied with both numerical and visual portrayal of information. The successful institutional researcher will provide a mix of presentations, not only to match the preferences of those being served but to provide the sort of balance that catches attention.

While the KISS Principle, its corollaries, and companion rules make good sense, they do exact a price. They require an extra investment of effort and consideration throughout the analytical process. This extra effort, which can only be made by the director or key staff, may delay the presentation of findings. It cannot be left to technicians or to those without the necessary synthesizing and communication skills or those who lack comprehensive knowledge of the entire problem.

Given the conflicting demands on institutional research offices, one must ask the question, "Who has the time?" The answer is just as simple:

You Must Make Time

The fact is that you can ill afford *not* to make time to do the

FEEDER COLLEGE ANALYSIS: AN UPDATE

by

Robert E. Cannon

This study examined the types and geographic locations of institutions attended by the faculty of Georgia State University.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the faculty recruitment patterns and provide a feeder college analysis to serve several objectives: a source of information for academic planning and to meet the requirements of the Self-Study, as well as Higher Education Guidelines with regard to the Affirmative Action Plan. This study is an update to Feeder College Analysis for the 1972-73 Faculty.

The highest earned degrees of the 1975-76 full-time faculty members were analyzed by number from institutions and states and were presented by total, schools, and organizational areas of Georgia State University.

Some of the highlights were:

- 140 different institutions in the United States and Europe have granted highest earned degrees to the faculty.
- Institutions located in 43 states are represented on the faculty. Georgia, North Carolina, New York, and Florida were the states with the largest numbers.
- The twelve southern states account for 53% of the highest earned degrees of the total faculty.
- These institutions conferred the highest degree to fifteen or more of the full-time teaching faculty: Duke University, Emory University, University of Florida, Georgia State University, University of Georgia, University of Iowa, University of North Carolina, Ohio State University, and Purdue University.

Distribution: Provost, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Academic Deans, Department Heads and appropriate Self-Study Chairmen.

July, 1976 Report No. 77-1

Figure 5: Sample page from a book of abstracts prepared at Georgia State University. Reprinted by permission.

job right. Many outstanding pieces of analysis have been ineffective because these lessons were not learned. Given scarce resources, no institutional research, policy analysis, or planning office can afford to have its work ignored or to create less than its maximum impact. Moreover, the growth of distributed data systems and more decentralized analysis is likely to increase, not diminish, the need for effective presentation. While institutional researchers at all levels must be aware of these problems, it is the special responsibility of the director to continually consider ways to maximize the impact of analysis—guided by the tenets which are suggested here. Only the director has the experience, perspective, and "clout" to apply the techniques of Triage to the art of institutional research.

Take another look at the earlier "portrait" of our academic administrator. If you follow the maxims outlined here, you might just see a smile of approval show on that otherwise troubled face.

The AIR Professional File is published by the Association for Institutional Research, 314 Stone Building, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 32306 up to four times per year. The *Professional File* is intended as a presentation of papers which synthesize and interpret issues, operations, and research of interest in the field of institutional research. Authors are responsible for material presented.

The editor for the first sixteen issues has been Richard R. Perry, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, The University of Toledo, 2801 W. Bancroft, Toledo, OH 43606. Effective with issue No. 17, the editor will be Gerald W. McLaughlin, Associate Director of Institutional Research, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 128 Smyth Hall, Blacksburg, VA 24061.

© 1983 The Association for Institutional Research

THE ASSOCIATION FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

314 Stone Building, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida 32306 (904) 644-4470 EID 36 6149972

AIR Professional File Order Form

Please type or print.

Name _____ Total amount enclosed U.S. $_____
Make check payable to AIR.

Address _____

_____
(city) *(state/province)* *(country)* *(zip)*

Series number	Title/Author	ERIC number	Number of copies	Price per copy	Total this item
No. 1	*Organizing for Institutional Research* by John William Ridge (6 pp.)	ED 168 384		$ 2.00	$
No. 2	*Dealing with Information Systems: The Institutional Researcher's Problems and Prospects* by Laura E. Saunders (4 pp.)	ED 178 005		2.00	
No. 3	*Formula Budgeting and the Financing of Public Higher Education: Panacea or Nemesis for the 1980s* by Francis M. Gross (6 pp.)	ED 178 004		2.00	
No. 4	*Methodology and Limitations of Ohio Enrollment Projections* by Gayla A. Kraetsch (8 pp.)	ED 180 391		2.00	
No. 5	*Conducting Data Exchange Programs* by Allan M. Bloom and James R. Montgomery (4 pp.)	ED 180 359		2.00	
No. 6	*Choosing a Computer Language for Institutional Research* by Denise Strenglein (4 pp.)	ED 189 998		2.00	
No. 7	*Cost Studies in Higher Education* by Stephen R. Hample (4 pp.)	ED 195 199		2.00	
No. 8	*Institutional Research and External Agency Reporting Responsibility* by Gary Davis (4 pp.)	ED 200 074		2.00	
No. 9	*Coping with Curricular Change in Academe* by Gerlinda S. Melchiori (4 pp.)	ED 207 436		2.00	
No. 10	*Computing and Office Automation—Changing Variables* by E. Michael Staman (6 pp.)	ED 213 377		2.00	
No. 11	*Resource Allocation in U.K. Universities* by Bryan J. R. Taylor (8 pp.)	ED 216 612		2.00	
No. 12	*Career Development in Institutional Research* by Mark D. Johnson (5 pp.)	ED 216 610		2.00	
No. 13	*The Institutional Research Director: Professional Development and Career Path* by William Fenstemacher (6 pp.)	ED 221 143		2.00	
No. 14	*A Methodological Approach to Selective Cutbacks* by Charles A. Bélanger and Lise Tremblay (7 pp.)	In process		2.00	
No. 15	*Effective Use of Models in the Decision Process: Theory Grounded in Three Case Studies* by Martha Mayo (Hinman) and Ruth E. Kallio (8 pp.)	In process		2.00	
No. 16	*Triage and the Art of Institutional Research* by Donald M. Norris (6 pp.)	In process		2.00	
1-16	**THE AIR PROFESSIONAL FILE (reissue in a bound volume)**	N/A		18.00	

*In cooperation with the John H. Russel Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Toledo; anticipated publication date—September 1983.

Total cost of publications prepaid/U.S. $ _____